



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the verbal coincidence of the *Dialexeis* and the pseudo-Platonic *περὶ δικαίου* in the expressions *ἐν τῷ δέοντι* and *καιρῷ* prove beyond a doubt that both used a common fifth-century source, and further justifies the conclusion that the *περὶ δικαίου* belongs to about the first decade after Socrates' death, and that its doctrine of *καιρός* is derived not from Gorgias but from Protagoras. Now as a matter of fact (1) almost any Greek writer could use those innocent expressions and *καιρός* is one of the earliest of Greek commonplaces; (2) they are not found together in the *Dialexeis*, but *καιρῷ* occurs in number 2, and *ἐν δέοντι* in number 4; (3) the *περὶ δικαίου* is steeped in Platonic reminiscences, and if its author required a source for *ἐν (τῷ) δέοντι* he could have found it in *Rep.* 414B, as he could have found his similar application of *ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ* in *Rep.* 389B and 334B, and as he could have found in *Symp.* 181A the entire thought (though not the words) of the argument that no act is good or bad in itself, but only through the manner of its performance.

PAUL SHOREY

Luciani quae feruntur Podagra et Ocypus. Praefatus edidit commentatus est JOHANNES ZIMMERMANN. Lipsiae: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, MCMIX. Pp. 82.

These two short pieces in verse have led a shifting existence, now accepted by some editors as legitimate Lucianic offspring, now rejected by others as supposititious twins, while by a smaller number of commentators their claims have been differentiated and the *Tragopodagra* alone admitted to the list of the author's genuine writings. Few, even of seasoned Lucian students, have cared to give them much more than cursory attention. Most readers are well content to reject them as spurious or to accept them apologetically as indicative of the advanced senility of the ex-rhetorician, dropping into verse as he shuffled into his grave.

M. Croiset, however, after admitting (*La vie et les œuvres de Lucien*, p. 84) that these two dialogues alone would never have won immortality for the writer, adds: "Mais il y a de l'esprit, du trait, et ce genre d'enjouement ironique et moqueur qui lui était propre. Nous n'avons donc pas de raison suffisante pour les déclarer apocryphes." A verdict based upon such grounds from a writer usually so keen to detect the true Lucianic hall-marks would have greater weight were it not that an attentive reading of the two pieces brings out so clearly the jejune banality of the *Ocypus*, both in matter and manner, that it would seem probable that M. Croiset has transferred the merits, belonging to the *Tragopodagra* alone, to his estimate of both on the ground that they must stand or fall together.

It is just here that Zimmermann's monograph forms a real contribution. He dissociates the two, claiming that the *Tragopodagra* is genuine and the *Ocypus* spurious, and proceeds to examine them with somewhat meticulous Teutonic detail and occasional over-emphasis of nonessentials.

In the preface Zimmermann gives an account of the nine codices upon which he mainly relies. Then follow: the Greek text of the two pieces, with critical notes; a general commentary; statistics and analysis of the meters; analysis of the vocabulary employed; literary reminiscences and imitation; discussion of authorship.

The choice of readings and the emendations of the text are, as a rule, well considered (though on *Pod.* 19 $\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ for $\pi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ seems hardly warranted).

The general notes contribute items of interest, especially the observations on the meters of the chorals in the *Tragopodagra*, which may well be Lucian's handiwork, either as reminiscent of Anacreontics or as mocking imitations of the curtailed anapaests—"Hinkanapaests," i.e., ending in an iambus—current in the second century after Christ, or of the so-called dactylic "hexametri miuri"—i.e., with an iambus substituted for the last foot.

In the case of the parody of the conventional tag appended to four plays of Euripides (which Zimmermann somewhat carelessly speaks of as an imitation of Euripides himself), it might have been some slight reinforcement to his contention for the genuineness of the *Tragopodagra* to cite the conclusion of Lucian's *Symposium*.

Zimmermann's notes on the *Ocypus*—a composition denuded of any choral charm, marred with false syntax, late forms and vocabulary, and devoid of any suspicion of humor—prepare us for his subsequent verdict against its genuineness. The use, however, of $\pi\omicron\iota$ for $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ (line 68), establishing, as it does, Euripidean reminiscence, need hardly be cited as a "notable" slip.

The minute discussion of metrical details not only establishes greater carelessness on the part of the author of the *Ocypus* but indicates that the metrical habits of the writers of the two pieces were divergent.

Although in summing up the vocabulary of the *Tragopodagra* there is given a somewhat formidable list of Ionic¹ forms (justified, however, by tragic coloring) and of words not elsewhere used by Lucian, yet Zimmermann's contention is not unreasonable that this would be quite in keeping, in verse composition, with Lucian's well-known characteristic of employing a special vocabulary for a specific purpose. Both the bad syntax and the inane repetition of dull expressions present in the *Ocypus*, are at least inconspicuous in the *Tragopodagra*. The conspectus of reminiscences from the Tragedians is not very convincing but the tragic coloring of the vocabulary in the *Tragopodagra* is evident.

The argument from the order observed in the various codices is ingenious and adds weight to the rejection of the *Ocypus*. Lucian's satire of his contemporaries is perhaps responsible for the Orphic suggestions and perhaps

¹ $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$, *Tragopod.* 10, is ignored. Compare Lucian's experiment with imitating Ionic in *de dea Syria* if this, as is at least possible, be accepted as Lucianic contrary to the general opinion.

for the further use of the current fashion of unusual metrical schemes. As Zimmermann suggests, the *Carmen Diophantis* also employs the "cholana-paests" in introducing a sufferer with the gout.

One phase, as it may seem, Zimmerman develops insufficiently. While he does emphasize the mocking satire upon the orthodox gods in the claims put forth by *Podagra*, and in one sentence briefly remarks: "Nec sane *Podagra* fabula tam facete composita Luciani ingenio indigna est," yet he might well have supplemented the more obvious suggestions of vocabulary and meter by a fuller discussion of the delicate criteria of Lucian's humor which may, perhaps, be detected in the *Tragopodagra*.

Although the argument that Lucian would not have repeated this same theme in a second piece seems hardly cogent in view of the many instances to the contrary in the Lucianic canon, the inferior character of the *Ocypus* itself is made out well enough.

Zimmermann, finally, tries to prove that the *Ocypus* was written in the year 364 A.D. by Acacius the friend of Libanius. This is based on a reference in one of Libanius' letters to a "witty" piece on this theme which Acacius had sent him. Since Acacius and Libanius were both at this time victims of the disease, it would perhaps be only charitable to think of them as already sufficiently punished without attributing to the one the authorship or to the other the commendation of this jejune piece.

If the *Ocypus* was really written by Lucian, and not by Acacius or some other unknown author, we must assume that the gout had by this time attacked him in both feet. In the *Tragopodagra* he limps, indeed, but can still bustle about like Hephaestus with his cup of humor not wholly emptied.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON

Die Dioskuren als Retter zur See bei den Griechen und Römern, und ihr Fortleben in christlichen Legenden. VON KARL JAISLE. Dissertation. Tübingen, 1907.

This dissertation is divided into two parts: a good collection chronologically arranged of the references in Greek and Latin literature and inscriptions to the Dioscuri as protectors on the sea, and a discussion of the supposed survival of these gods in Christian saints. The former has considerable value as a collection of material; the latter is of little worth.

In the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as every reader of Homer knows, Castor is only a master-driver and Polydeuces a master-boxer. But in the Homeric hymn 33, which probably belongs to the sixth century B.C., the brothers appear (vss. 6 ff.) with their later function fully developed: they are σωτήρες . . . ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων ὀκυπόρων τε νεών. Thenceforth they have this office clearly defined in Greek literature and in Latin poetry influenced by the Greek, without losing their general character as horsemen who assist men in time of battle or of other need. This specialization of function can